

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

In the city of Yakima Washington, where I grew up, I watched as all the major local radio stations were bought by one company. This resulted in far less diversity in programming, especially in the area of news and community events. All the radio stations are now broadcasting identical news programming, since one company's news office provides all the reports. Diversity of viewpoints is non-existent in Yakima radio. This is a clear example of the importance of ownership limits to promote diversity of expression. Furthermore, whereas there were once stations owned and controlled by members of Yakima's large hispanic population, white males now dominate the ownership and control of Yakima radio.

Locally owned and controlled media outlets serve their communities more effectively than chain properties, because locally owned outlets are able to tailor their programming to the specific needs of a community. This includes coverage of local community social, artistic, and religious events. I have seen a decrease in this community focus. Instead Yakima radio sounds identical to stations owned by the same company in any city in the country. This has not been accompanied by an increase in quality of programming. It has simply grown more homogenous.